



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,098	03/12/2004	Holger Edinger	A-3930	7618
24131	7590	12/28/2007		
LERNER GREENBERG STEMER LLP			EXAMINER	
P O BOX 2480			MORRISON, THOMAS A	
HOLLYWOOD, FL 33022-2480			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3653	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/28/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/799,098

Applicant(s)

EDINGER, HOLGER

Examiner

Thomas A. Morrison

Art Unit

3653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 12-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 12-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/17/2007 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. Claims 3-5, 8 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1. Claim 1 recites "a sheet transport direction". After this, claim 3 recites "a sheet transport direction". It is unclear if the recited "a sheet transport direction" in claim 3 is the same or different from the previously recited "a sheet transport direction" in claim 1.

Claim 8 depends from claim 7, which ultimately depends from claim 6. Claim 6 recites "a sheet transport direction". After this, claim 8 recites "a sheet transport direction". It is unclear if the recited "a sheet transport direction" in claim 8 is the same or different from the previously recited "a sheet transport direction" in claim 6.

Claim 12 recites the limitation "said nozzle" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 14 depends from claim 9, which ultimately depends from claim 6. Claim 6 recites "a sheet transport direction". After this, claim 14 recites "a sheet transport direction". It is unclear if the recited "a sheet transport direction" in claim 14 is the same or different from the previously recited "a sheet transport direction" in claim 6.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-9 and 12-16, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,214,088 (Seybold).

Regarding claim 1, Figs. 1-17 of Seybold disclose a method for guiding sheets to a sheet processing machine, which comprises the step of:

generating an overlapping stream of sheets (page 2, column 2, lines 62-65) guided over a table (element C in Fig. 1) in a sheet transport direction (from left to right in Fig. 1);

reducing an adhesion force (e.g., reducing adhesion via elements 195 and 196) between two sheets following one another in the overlapping stream by lifting a sheet trailing edge of a first sheet with a blown air jet (including 195 and 196) aimed in the sheet transport direction (i.e., from left to right in Fig. 1) blown out substantially tangentially over the first sheet.

Regarding claim 2, Figs. 1-17 show lifting the sheet trailing edge of the first sheet by blowing under from behind the sheet. See e.g., Fig. 9 for the lifting of the trailing edge of the first sheet.

Regarding claim 3, Figs. 2-3 show element 115 aligning the first sheet in a sheet transport direction before the sheet trailing edge of the first sheet is lifted.

Regarding claim 4, Figs. 2-3 show element 116 aligning the first sheet laterally at a same time as the sheet trailing edge of the first sheet is lifted.

Regarding claim 5, page 4 at column 1, lines 12-16 disclose aligning the first sheet laterally after the sheet trailing edge of the first sheet has been lifted. More specifically, this section and Figs. 2-3 disclose element 116 aligning the first sheet laterally during the feeding operation, which meets the limitations of claim 4.

Regarding claim 6, Figs. 1-17 disclose an apparatus for guiding sheets to a sheet processing machine, the apparatus comprising:

a lifting device (including 195 and 196) for reducing an adhesion force between two sheets following one another in an overlapping stream by lifting a sheet trailing edge of a first sheet, the lifting device (including 195 and 196) disposed above the first sheet of the overlapping stream, the lifting device (including 195 and 196) being an air jet aimed in a sheet transport direction substantially tangentially over the first sheet of the overlapping stream.

Regarding claim 7, Fig. 1-17 disclose a front edge alignment device (including 36), the lifting device (including 195 and 196) being disposed at a distance of a sheet length to be processed from the front edge alignment device (including 36).

Regarding claim 8, Figs. 4 and 10-12 show that the lifting device (including 195 and 196) can be adjusted in a sheet transport direction (i.e., adjusted vertically via movement of element 175) to a sheet format to be processed, e.g., thick sheets or thin sheets. Figs. 10-12 show that sheets are transported upward (i.e., in a vertical transport direction) while being lifted off of the stack.

Regarding claim 9, Fig. 1-17 show that the lifting device (including 195 and 196) has at least one nozzle (196).

Regarding claim 12, the nozzle (20) is formed as a blowing/suction nozzle and can be acted on with blown air. In the recitation "can be acted on with blown air" does not require that the nozzle actually be acted on with blown air. Rather, the nozzle (20) can be acted on with blown air. It is the examiner's position that the nozzle (20) can be acted on with blown air, e.g., by connecting an air line to such nozzle (20).

Regarding claim 13, the nozzle (20) is formed as a suction gripper and can be acted on with a vacuum.

Regarding claim 14, Fig. 11 shows that the lifting device (including 195 and 196) has a free jet nozzle (20) in addition to the nozzle (196), the free jet nozzle (20) being

aimed at the overlapping sheet stream obliquely from above in a sheet transport direction.

Regarding claim 15, Figs. 1-17 show that at least one of the nozzle (196) and the free jet nozzle (20) can be activated at a cycle rate of the sheet processing machine.

Regarding claim 16, Figs. 1-17 disclose a printing press (page 1 at column 1, lines 1-5), comprising:

- a sheet stack feeder (element C in Fig. 1);
- a first lifting apparatus (including 20) for forming an overlapping stream and disposed adjacent the sheet stack feeder (element C in Fig. 1); and
- a second lifting apparatus (including 195 and 196) disposed above a first sheet of the overlapping stream, the second lifting apparatus (including 195 and 196) being an air jet aimed in a sheet transport direction substantially tangentially over the first sheet of the overlapping stream.

4. Claims 1-3, 6-9 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,522,388 (Heine et al.).

Regarding claim 1, Fig. 6 of Heine et al. discloses a method for guiding sheets to a sheet processing machine, which comprises the step of:

generating an overlapping stream of sheets (column 6, lines 34-37) guided over a table (table shown in Fig. 6) in a sheet transport direction (sheet movement arrow in Fig. 6);

reducing an adhesion force (e.g., reducing adhesion via element 80) between two sheets following one another in the overlapping stream by lifting a sheet trailing edge of a first sheet with a blown air jet (80) aimed in the sheet transport direction blown out substantially tangentially over the first sheet. See column 6, lines 54-60 and column 7, lines 9-15. In particular, column 7, lines 9-15 explain that the angle of air from the air jet (80) can be varied over wide limits. As such, it is the examiner's position that the apparatus in Fig. 6 of Heine et al. can inherently be varied such that the blown air jet (80) is aimed in the sheet transport direction substantially tangentially over the first sheet.

Regarding claim 2, Fig. 6 shows lifting the sheet trailing edge of the first sheet by blowing under from behind the sheet. See also column 6, lines 54-60.

Regarding claim 3, column 6, lines 50-60 disclose aligning the first sheet in a sheet transport direction before the sheet trailing edge of the first sheet is lifted.

Regarding claim 6, Fig. 6 discloses an apparatus for guiding sheets to a sheet processing machine, the apparatus comprising:

a lifting device (including 80) for reducing an adhesion force between two sheets following one another in an overlapping stream by lifting a sheet trailing edge of a first



sheet, the lifting device (including 80) disposed above the first sheet of the overlapping stream, the lifting device (including 80) being an air jet aimed in a sheet transport direction (sheet movement arrow in Fig. 6) substantially tangentially over the first sheet of the overlapping stream. See also column 6, lines 54-60 and column 7, lines 9-15. In particular, column 7, lines 9-15 explain that the angle of air from the air jet (80) can be varied over wide limits. As such, it is the examiner's position that the apparatus in Fig. 6 of Heine et al. can inherently be varied such that the blown air jet (80) is aimed in the sheet transport direction substantially tangentially over the first sheet of the overlapping stream.

Regarding claim 7, Fig. 6 discloses a front edge alignment device (including 13), the lifting device (including 80) being disposed at a distance of a sheet length to be processed from the front edge alignment device (including 13).

Regarding claim 8, column 7, lines 9-15 disclose that the lifting device (including 80) can be adjusted in a sheet transport direction to a sheet format to be processed. In particular, while the element 80 of Heine et al. is being rotated (i.e., the angle is adjusted) one component of its movement is in the sheet transport direction, which meets the limitations of the claim.

Regarding claim 9, Fig. 6 shows that the lifting device (including 80) has at least one nozzle.

Regarding claim 12, Fig. 6 and column 7, lines 2-9 disclose that the nozzle is formed as a blowing/suction nozzle and can be acted on with blown air.

Regarding claim 13, column 7, lines 2-9 disclose that the nozzle is formed as a suction gripper. Also, the recitation "can be acted on with a vacuum" does not require that the nozzle actually be acted on with a vacuum. Rather, the nozzle can be acted on with a vacuum. It is the examiner's position that the nozzle (80) can be acted on with a vacuum, e.g., by connecting a vacuum line to such nozzle (80).

Regarding claim 14, column 6, lines 44-46 disclose that the lifting device has a free jet nozzle in addition to the nozzle (80), the free jet nozzle being aimed at the overlapping sheet stream obliquely from above in a sheet transport direction. More specifically, column 6, lines 44-46 disclose that multiple nozzles are provided which can be considered a nozzles and free jet nozzles, as claimed.

Regarding claim 15, column 6, lines 50-60 explain the cycle rate. Thus the nozzle and the free jet nozzle (i.e., the multiple nozzles) of column 6, lines 44-46 can be activated at a cycle rate of the sheet processing machine, as claimed.

Regarding claim 16, Figs. 5c and 6 disclose a printing press (column 1, lines 13-15), comprising:

- a sheet stack feeder (unnumbered belts in Fig. 6);

- a first lifting apparatus (including 20 in Fig. 5c) for forming an overlapping stream and disposed adjacent the sheet stack feeder (unnumbered belts in Fig. 6); and

- a second lifting apparatus (including 80) disposed above a first sheet of the overlapping stream, the second lifting apparatus (including 80) being an air jet aimed in

a sheet transport direction substantially tangentially over the first sheet of the overlapping stream. See also column 7, lines 9-15. In particular, column 7, lines 9-15 explain that the angle of air from the air jet (80) can be varied over wide limits. As such, it is the examiner's position that the apparatus in Fig. 6 of Heine et al. can inherently be varied such that the air jet (80) is aimed in the sheet transport direction substantially tangentially over the first sheet of the overlapping stream.

5. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,522,388 (Heine et al.).

Regarding claim 16, Figs. 5c and 6 disclose a printing press (column 1, lines 13-15), comprising:

a sheet stack feeder (unnumbered belts in Fig. 6);

a first lifting apparatus (including the cam lifting apparatus shown in Fig. 3) for forming an overlapping stream and disposed adjacent the sheet stack feeder (unnumbered belts in Fig. 6); and

a second lifting apparatus (including 80) disposed above a first sheet of the overlapping stream, the second lifting apparatus (including 80) being an air jet aimed in a sheet transport direction substantially tangentially over the first sheet of the overlapping stream. See also column 7, lines 9-15. In particular, column 7, lines 9-15 explain that the angle air from the air jet (80) can be varied over wide limits. As such, it is the examiner's position that the apparatus in Fig. 6 of Heine et al. can inherently be

varied such that the air jet (80) is aimed in the sheet transport direction substantially tangentially over the first sheet of the overlapping stream.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,522,388 (Heine et al.) as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,886,261 (Jeschke). U.S. Patent No. 4,522,388 (Heine et al.) discloses all of the limitations of claim 4, except for aligning the first sheet laterally at a same time as the sheet trailing edge of the first sheet is lifted (e.g., lifted via element 80 of U.S. Patent No. 4,522,388 (Heine et al.)).

The Jeschke patent discloses that it is well known to align a sheet laterally using side walls (including 8 and 9) that extend vertically above the topmost sheet of a stack of sheets, for the purpose of keeping the sheets laterally aligned. See e.g., column 5, lines 10-61 and Fig. 1. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the apparatus shown in Fig. 6 of U.S. Patent No. 4,522,388 (Heine et al.) with side walls for the purpose of keeping the sheets laterally aligned, as taught by Jeschke. Providing such walls on the device in Fig. 6 of U.S. Patent No. 4,522,388 (Heine et al.) in a manner as taught by Jeschke will result in

an arrangement that will align the first sheet laterally at a same time as the sheet trailing edge of the first sheet is lifted (e.g., lifted via element 80 of U.S. Patent No. 4,522,388 (Heine et al.)).

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heine et al. as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,624,807 (Schwebel).

Regarding claim 5, the Heine et al. patent discloses all of the limitations of claim 5, except for aligning the first sheet laterally after the sheet trailing edge of the first sheet is lifted.

Fig. 2 of Schwebel shows that it is well known to provide a sheet conveying apparatus with a plurality of nozzle assemblies (6, 7, 8 and 9) and spaced-apart side stops (4) for the purpose of aligning side edges of conveyed sheets. More specifically, Fig. 2 of Schwebel shows that the side stops (4) are positioned such that sheets enter the region where the nozzle assemblies (6, 7, 8 and 9) are located and such sheets are acted on by the nozzle assemblies (6, 7, 8 and 9) before coming into contact with one of the side stops (4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the Heine et al. apparatus with side stops for the purpose of aligning side edges of sheets conveyed on the Heine et al. apparatus, as taught by Schwebel. Positioning side stops on the Heine et al. apparatus in a manner as taught by Schwebel will result in the side stops being spaced away from incoming sheets such that the incoming sheets are laterally aligned after the sheet has already

been acted upon by the nozzles (i.e., after the trailing edge has been lifted by the nozzle (80) of Heine et al.). Thus, all of the limitations of claim 5 are met.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments filed 9/17/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues

The reference does not show reducing an adhesion force between two sheets following one another in the overlapping stream by lifting a sheet trailing edge of a first sheet with a blown air jet aimed in the sheet transport direction blown out substantially tangentially over the first sheet, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. The Heine reference discloses that a blower that is directed obliquely to a sheet. The blower creates an air film underneath a first sheet. Heine does not disclose that the blower creates a blown air jet aimed in the sheet transport direction substantially tangentially over a first sheet. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, which recites reducing an adhesion force between two sheets following one another in the overlapping stream by lifting a sheet trailing edge of a first sheet with a blown air jet aimed in the sheet transport direction blown out substantially tangentially over the first sheet. Since claim 1 is allowable over Heine, dependent claims 2 and 3 are allowable over Heine as well.

In response, Heine et al. discloses reducing an adhesion force (e.g., reducing adhesion via element 80) between two sheets following one another in the overlapping stream by lifting a sheet trailing edge of a first sheet with a blown air jet (80) aimed in the sheet transport direction blown out substantially tangentially over the first sheet. See column 6, lines 54-60 and column 7, lines 9-15. In particular, column 7, lines 9-15 recite that, "By reason of the dual adjustment, the rate of air flow and the angle at which the air blast strikes the underside of the sheet may be independently varied over wide

limits thereby accommodating the device to a wide variety of paper stock ranging all the way from tissue to cardboard and having a wide range of surface texture." (emphasis added). As such, the angle of the air from air jet (80) can be varied over wide limits. Thus, it is the examiner's position that the apparatus in Fig. 6 of Heine et al. can inherently be varied such that the blown air jet (80) is aimed in the sheet transport direction substantially tangentially over the first sheet. Thus, all of the limitations of claim 1 are met by Heine et al.

Next, applicant argues

On pages 3 and 5 of the Office action, the Examiner alleges that Heine discloses "the lifting device (including 80) disposed above the first sheet of the overlapping stream, the lifting device (including 80) being an air jet aimed in a sheet transport direction (sheet movement arrow in Fig. 6) substantially tangentially over the first sheet of the overlapping stream." It is respectfully noted that the Examiner is in error.

Particularly, Heine explicitly discloses when the sheet reaches the front stops, it is subject to an air blast therefrom which passes as a film beneath the tail of the first sheet, separating the first sheet from the next sheet so that the next sheet is not entrained (column 6, lines 54-60). Fig. 6 of Heine explicitly shows that the air blast is oblique to the sheets being transported (see Fig. 6 of Heine provided above). Therefore, Heine discloses that a blower provides an air blast oblique to the sheets, which creates a film beneath the first sheet. Heine does not disclose air jet disposed above the first sheet of the sheet stream aimed in a direction substantially tangentially over the first sheet in an overlapping sheet stream. Therefore, it is respectfully noted that the Examiner's allegations pertaining to an air jet in Heine, are not accurate.

As seen from the above given remarks, the reference does not show the lifting device disposed above the first sheet of the overlapping stream, the lifting device being an air jet aimed in a sheet transport direction substantially tangentially over the first sheet of the overlapping stream, as recited in claims 6 and 16 of the instant application. The Heine reference discloses that a blower creates an air blast that is oblique to a sheet transport direction. Heine does not disclose a lifting device being an air jet aimed in a sheet transport direction substantially tangentially over the first sheet of the overlapping stream. This is contrary to the invention of the

instant application as claimed, which recites that the lifting device is disposed above the first sheet of the overlapping stream, the lifting device is an air jet aimed in a sheet transport direction substantially tangentially over the first sheet of the overlapping stream. Since claim 6 is allowable over Heine, dependent claims 7-9, and 12-15 are allowable over Heine as well.

In response, Heine et al. discloses a lifting device (including 80) for reducing an adhesion force between two sheets following one another in an overlapping stream by lifting a sheet trailing edge of a first sheet, the lifting device (including 80) disposed above the first sheet of the overlapping stream, the lifting device (including 80) being an air jet aimed in a sheet transport direction (sheet movement arrow in Fig. 6) substantially tangentially over the first sheet of the overlapping stream, as set forth in claim 6. See also column 6, lines 54-60 and column 7, lines 9-15. Similarly, Heine et al. discloses a second lifting apparatus (including 80) disposed above a first sheet of the overlapping stream, the second lifting apparatus (including 80) being an air jet aimed in a sheet transport direction substantially tangentially over the first sheet of the overlapping stream, as set forth in claim 16. See also column 7, lines 9-15. In particular, column 7, lines 9-15 recite that, "By reason of the dual adjustment, the rate of air flow and the angle at which the air blast strikes the underside of the sheet may be independently varied over wide limits thereby accommodating the device to a wide variety of paper stock ranging all the way from tissue to cardboard and having a wide range of surface texture." (emphasis added). As such, the angle of the air from air jet (80) can be varied over wide limits. Thus, it is the examiner's position that the apparatus in Fig. 6 of Heine et al. can inherently be varied such that the air jet (80) is



aimed in the sheet transport direction substantially tangentially over the first sheet.

Thus, all of the limitations of claims 6 and 16 are met by Heine et al.

***Conclusion***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas A. Morrison whose telephone number is (571) 272-7221. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Mackey can be reached on (571) 272-6916. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

12/19/2007

  
PATRICK MACKEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600